REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-6 and 9-10 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 13-15 have been added.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Examiner rejects claims 1, 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohler et al. (Kohler) in view of Miloslavsky et al. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5 and 9, and respectfully traverse the rejection as amended.

Claim 1 recites the following elements:

> *"receiving at least first and second incoming calls;*
> *retaining the first incoming call in a first state;*
> *waiting until the first incoming call progresses to a second state;*
> *answering the second incoming call and placing it in the first state after the first incoming call progresses to the second state"*

Examiner argues that the Kohler teaches such elements at column 10 lines 15-45. However such passage merely describes calls in a queue that are waiting to be matched with an appropriate agent. In particular, Kohler places calls in a queue, and "calls that have been waiting the longest are examined first." Col. 10 ll. 26-27. Further "in the event that an agent is found... the call is connected to that agent and...he is automatically removed from the queue." Col. 10 ll. 40-45.

The passage cited does not teach "retaining the first incoming call in a first state" and then "answering the second incoming call and placing it in the first state **after** the first incoming call progresses to the first state." Neither the queue nor the connected status described in the passage cited by the Examiner can be the first state. First, according to Kohler, each call is placed in a queue, and both the first and second incoming call is unanswered in the queue. This queue cannot be the recited first state because both the first and second incoming calls are in this state simultaneously. Second, once the first incoming call is connected, Kohler does not teach that the first call must leave this state before the second call is answered. As such, both the first and second incoming calls can be connected at the same time. Therefore, the connected status cannot be the recited first state either.

Independent claims 5 and 9 recite similar limitations and are allowable for at least the same reasons stated above. Additionally, claims 2, 6, 10 and 13-15 are dependent from independent claims 1, 5, or 9 and are allowable for at least the same reasons stated above as well.

CONCLUSION

In view of these arguments, all claims are now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is therefore requested.

*****

Respectfully submitted,

September 24, 2009
Date

/Billy C. Allen III/
Billy C. Allen III
Reg. No. 46,147

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
   RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
832/446-2400
832/446-2424 (facsimile)
wcpatent@counselip.com